Va 1102 .C6 v.1

N

J.

CANADA

UNDER THE

NATIONAL POLICY

THE LOGIC OF FACTS.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

J. F. WOOD, M. P. FOR BROCKVILLE,

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ON THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1885.

BROCKVILLE:
DAILY TIMES PRINTING HOUSE.

1885

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

(Toronto Mail, March 20th, 1885.)

"Mr. Wood, of Brockville, made, as he always does, a logical speech, clearly and forcibly presenting unanswerable arguments to the assertions of the Opposition. His choice language, courteous manner, and closereasoning always command the attention of the House. He studies out carefully his arguments, supplies facts that cannot be contradicted, and invariably throws new light upon any subject he discusses. He was interrupted by frequent applause as he passed from point to point in his powerful presentation of the benefits which had flowed from the National Policy. At the close of his speech, Sir John Macdonald and a number of members congratulated him warmly on his success."

(Montreal Gazette, March 20th, 1885.)

"One of the best speeches of the session was delivered by Mr. Wood, the member for Brockville. He spoke for three-quarters of an hour and held the close attention of the house during the whole of his speech. He has the happy faculty of hitting off his point without too much detail and making it clear and distinct. He showed the disingenuousness of the members of the opposition when they lamented the decreasing population in Ontario, while their friends in Toronto, at almost the same moment, were proposing to ask for an increased subsidy from the Dominion on the ground of the largely increased population of the province, and made it clear to the house that whatever may be said to the contrary, the consumer in this country does not pay the duty on coals, but that it is paid by the manufacturer. When he stated that the present government in framing the N. P. in 1878 were only voicing the sentiments of the workingmen of this country, and that it was just as popular and strong in the hearts of the people to-day as at that time, he was greeted with vociferous applause, showing that he uttered the opinions of a majority of the members of the house, at any rate. At the conclusion of his speech, Mr. Wood was heartily and deservedly congratulated by his many friends, including the prime minister. It is to be hoped that his voice will be heard oftener in the deliberations of the house, as he bids fair to take a front rank among our parliamentary debaters."

(Brockville Times, March 25th, 1885.)

"The excellent speech made by Mr. J. F. Wood, M. P., for Brockville, in the house of commons, during the budget debate, which speech we have published in full, will be read with a great deal of pleasure by his constituents, and by all who take an interest in the political welfare of the country, no matter in what part of the Dominion they may happen to live. Mr. Wood is to be congratulated on the masterly manner in which he dealt with the subject in hand. The powerful arguments, backed by substantial evidence of figures, which he brought to bear, in pointing out the effects of the national policy in developing the interests and conducing to the welfare of the people of Canada as a whole, showed that they were the results of close study and careful investigation. His arraignment of the reform party on the charge of inconsistency in the question of population is particularly good. It is pointed out how in the Ontario legislature, the reform party, when seeking increased subsidy, claim that such is necessary owing to the increase in the population of the province, while in the Dominion parliament they contend that the popu-

lation is decreasing owing to the working of the national policy. This is exactly in accordance with the average grit record for inconsistency. Mr. Wood deals with the coal question in an able manner, and proves by figures gained from personal inquiry, that the people of Canada pay no more for their fuel than do their neighbors across the line in the country from which the coal is imported. This proves beyond all dispute that in the case of coal coming into Canada the consumer does not have to bear the burden of the duty. Another very important point dealt with by Mr. Wood, is the increased purchasing power of money at the present day as compared with 1878, previous to the present tariff system coming into effect. A bill of general household goods that in 1878 would cost $41.75 can now be purchased for $28.60, thus effecting a saving of over thirty per cent., certainly a very important item to the workingmen who depend upon their daily earnings to provide the necessaries of life. Under the national policy the country has prospered, and the electors of Canada were so well satisfied with its working, that after four year's experience, they emphatically reaffirmed, the verdict they gave in 1878, when tired of the tree trade nostrums of the Mackenzie government they gave them notice to quit, and by an overwhelming majority decided to place the conduct of the country's affairs in the hands of Sir John A. Macdonald, under the banner of the national policy. Many other important points are taken up by Mr. Wood, in his address, to which we have not space to refer, but which are dealt with in the same vigorous manner as those mentioned above. The speech should be carefully read by all. It is generally acknowledged to have been one of the best efforts made during the session by any member of the House, and the electors of the constituency of Brockville have reason to congratulate themselves that in Mr. Wood they have such an able representative in the halls of parliament."

(Montreal Herald, March 26th, 1885.)

The special correspondent in Ottawa of the Montreal *Herald* writing to that paper under date of March 24th says:

"The interminable budget debate proceeded to-day as usual, and I am told on reliable authority that there are fifteen or twenty more speeches on either side. One cannot but regret that there is not some way to bring those interminable babblers to a stop. They know that the House does not listen to them, that no one takes any interest in what they say, and indeed the signal for clearing the benches is when some of these people, who imagine that they are orators, get up to speak. * * * One occasionally gets some information and has an opportunity of listening to a speech that contains matter both interesting and instructive, such as the speech of Mr. Wood, of Brockville, on Friday last, which was delivered in a clear and unpretentious style and contained much matter that was interesting and instructive."

A SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

J. F. WOOD, M. P. FOR BROCKVILLE,

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 19, 1885.

In the House of Commons on Thursday, March 19th, Mr. John F. Wood, M. P. for Brockville, took part in the budget debate. He spoke as follows:—

At this late period of the debate, and the late hour of the evening, I shall not at any length, attempt a defence of the principles of the National Policy. It must appear very strange to the people of the country that in the year 1885 we are still in this House defending on the one side the National Policy from the attacks made upon it on the other side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, if that be the state of things, it must be conceded on all hands that the fault is not ours that this debate is being prolonged. Hon. gentlemen on the other side, as was truly said by an hon. member on this side a few days ago, are like the Bourbons of old. They forget not, nor do they learn. Well, Sir, it seems most remarkable notwithstanding that in 1878 the country pronounced so unmistakably and emphatically upon this issue—the only issue before the people at that time—that issue which restored to the first minister the confidence of the people of Canada, which for a brief period they, much to their sorrow and regret, had withdrawn from him and that again in 1882 they most emphatically re-affirmed the verdict they then gave—I say it is strange that nothwithstanding all this we find hon. gentlemen opposite more pronounced in their opposition to this policy than at any period since its adoption by the people of Canada. I am sure, Sir, that we, speaking from a party point of view, and speaking also with a view to the best interests of the country, have no reason to regret the position which hon. gentlemen take in this respect, provided they were just a little more temperate in the language they use. I am aware, Sir, that when I make use of that language I am stating that which has been made use of by many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I am aware that leading

members on the other side of the House, hon gentlemen who have been raising their voices, not only inside of this House but outside of this House, on this subject, affect a grievous tone—a tone of deep-seated injury, when they refer to the fact that we on this side have occasionally stated that their remarks laid them open to the charge of not being just as patriotic as they should have been. But if you take the remarks of the last speaker, the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick, when he comes out flat-footed, not only as a free trader—that, he has a perfect right to do—but against the principles of confederation; when you hear him make use of that statement openly and above board to this House and to the country, we can gauge the extent of the affection which that hon. gentleman entertains for what he appears to think so much of—the autonomy of this whole Dominion. Mr. speaker, I am very much amused when I see hon. gentlemen affecting this tone of grievous injury when we make use of language of this kind. Why sir, we, the conservative contingent of the right hon. first minister, who reside in the Province of Ontario, have been stigmatised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the press of their party, as traitors to the province in which we live. They have not hesitated to brand us as such, and still they affect the tone of grievous injury when we on this side of the House use very moderate language to describe the utterances they employ in speaking of this our native country. Sir, I was very much struck in the references which have been made so far in this debate to the so-called exodus from Ontario and it is simply because these remarks have been made concerning Ontario that I have risen to address a few remarks to this House, and ask your indulgence for that purpose. At the very outset of this debate, when the ex-finance minister was making his lengthy criticisms upon the speech of the finance minister, he led off in the strain that the population of Ontario was decreasing in consequence of this National Policy, and that seems to be the cue which was taken by almost every hon. gentleman who followed him, down to the last interesting and highly amusing address to which we have just listened from the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Gillmor.) Sir, it always appeared to me that the school reports from which the ex-finance minister drew his inferences and obtained his facts, and which he first made use of in Montreal, in the address delivered by him during last summer, must be wrong; and at the time I first read his address I had nothing more than other hon. gentlemen in this House have to guide them. I had simply the evidence of my observation of the locality in which I live. I knew that in my own town, and in the county I have the honor to represent, the population was increasing; the value of real estate was increasing, and general prosperity reigned. Well, Sir, I do not know but I might challenge hon. gentlemen in this House to get up and state whether or not the population in the constituencies they represent in this House is not increasing. I believe, Sir, if I threw out this challenge to hon. gentlemen opposite, not a single one, especially from the

province of Ontario, would dare to get up and state that the population in the county he represents was decreasing. Now, Mr. speaker, if those statements are wrong, if the facts so carefully compiled by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) are true—and I believe they are, because they are borne out by the evidence of our senses, if not by the census to which hon. gentlemen object—if these are true, who are the traitors to Ontario. Are they the men who, following the leadership of the First Minister and our common leaders, are endeavouring to work out the legislation of this country in the lines and upon the principles laid down by the fathers of the confederation; or are they those who, if they studied the facts carefully, must know they are wrong—yet will persist in publishing to the world that the population of this their native province—of which they pose as the special champions—is decreasing, tha our sons are going to a foreign country and are turning their backs on the homes of their fathers and the flag that sheltered them? Who are the traitors to Ontario, if these facts are wrong? Now, it is a strange commentary on the language of the ex-Finance Minister, and of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), both of whom stated, almost in the same words, that in their belief, taking the facts they alluded to, the population of Ontario was continuously decreasing—I say it is a strange commentary on the truthfulness of that statement that, almost at the very time the ex-finance minister was making use of that remark there were proceedings going on in the Legislature of Ontario, having in view the idea of coming to this House for an increase in the subsidies granted to the Province under the British North America Act. During the course of the debate on that question the provincial treasurer, in discussing the subject, made use of the following remarks, as reported in the *Globe* of 4th March:—

"The increased population has brought to us an increased expenditure, but to the Dominion government only increased revenue. So I say that if we are forced to look for a new basis on which the subsidy is granted, let it be on the basis of population, and give us an increased subsidy, say every ten years."

Now, Mr. speaker, who is right, the ex-minister of finance or the present treasurer of Ontario? But that is not all. Another member of the same government said:

"So, as Ontario grew in population, and the expenditure increased, it was seen that more money was required to carry on the affairs of the province."

In other words, we find the present opposition in this House, for the sake of making some capital against this government, crying out, to the injury of our province, that its population is decreasing, that our sons are leaving our shores, while for the same reason of gaining a little party advantage or perhaps annoying this government, in another parliament the provincial treasurer says just the reverse. For the purpose of making party capital they are willing to ride two horses at the same time, and to take any position, however, contrary it may be to the facts. I am aware, sir, that it is a very bold thing in any man to say anything against the Mowat government; I am aware that one of the members of Mr. Mowat's

cabinet must be more nearly right, according to the views entertained by hon gentlemen opposite, than the ex-minister of finance; therefore, I conclude that the provincial treasurer is right, and the population of Ontario is increasing; and, as an additional fact in support of that, I would allude to the evidence furnished by the report of the bureau of industries in Ontario, which is most damaging to their utterances on this subject. I would request hon. gentlemen to look to the information supplied by that report, as to the population in their own counties, before they undertake to publish to the world that the population of the province is decreasing to such an alarming extent. I would specially suggest to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to look into that report, by which he will find that, under the operation of the national policy there has been a very large measure of prosperity in the county of Norfolk. Of course, it is a fact that we cannot expect him to admit in this House; but we can expect these hon. gentlemen not to state what investigation on their part would prove to be untrue.

Now, there is another question to which I wish to allude. I am aware that when any resident of the Province of Ontario declares that in this country the consumer does not pay the import duty charged upon coal he is sneered at by the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite; but, sir, I am one of those who believe that the consumer in Ontario does not pay the duty on coal, and I will tell you why. I listened with a great deal of attention to the argument used by Sir Charles Tupper in this House two or three sessions ago on this subject. The idea was new to my mind, and though not altogether converted then to the fact, I believe to-day that the consumer in the Province of Ontario does not pay the duty on coal. In support of this, I wish to refer to what occurred during last summer in the city of Philadelphia. The inhabitants of that city complained that though they were on the brink of the mining district, they had to pay 65 cents a ton more for their coal than the people of Boston, hundreds of miles away, and quite as much as the inhabitants of Canada, whose coal was subject to heavy freight charges, and to a duty of 50 cents a ton. In Philadelphia the coal companies have no competition and they charge as they please, while in Boston and other eastern cities they are compelled to keep their prices low, to meet the English coal and that from Nova Scotia. It thus happens that notwithstanding the distance of 800 miles, which is against us as compared with Philadelphia, and in spite of the duty, we secure our coal at as low a figure as do the Philadelphians, whose nearness to the mines should be a point in their favor. Now, sir, in the month of June last a committee of the Philadelphia city council was appointed to investigate the charges of discrimination of rates made against coal and coal carrying companies by one of the city papers. The enquiry is of interest to the Canadians, chiefly because it elicited evidence sustaining the view I have expressed. President Roberts, of the Pennsylvania railway,

in a letter dated 20th June, to the committee of investigation, says:

"The rates that are now charged by our company for carrying soft coal are made for the purpose of meeting the competition of the various markets in which coal is introduced."

And he defends this discrimination by saying:

"Pennsylvania does not suffer by it, but on the contrary is benefitted by it, because without it coal would be no cheaper to local consumers, while with it a large force of coal miners and other operatives are added to the wealth producers of the State."

Mr. James E. Gowan, one of the managers of the Reading Co., also wrote to the committee, and this is what he says:

"It has been customary, for the past thirty or forty years, to allow drawbacks on coal bought for exportation. I cannot say to what extent the custom prevails now, but I can say that only for it Pennsylvania coal would not have been introduced at all into many places where it now is. The price of coal is regulated by competition, and we have to do business like other people; no man is in business who does not do the best he can for himself, and companies exist to make money."

Now, one of the strongest arguments against the national policy made use of by the free traders in the province of Ontario, is that the poor man has to pay 50 cents a ton on the coal he uses, and as coal is one of the necessaries of life, that is to the workingmen of this country a very strong argument against the national policy. But it is a fact in proof of what I have read, that in towns along the river St. Lawrence, which are separated from the United States only by the river, the people pay no more for their coal than do the people of the towns in the State of New York, on the other side of the river. Last Saturday coal was $6 a ton in the city of Ogdensburg, and the same price in Prescott, just across the river. I mention this to show that in these matters, which are constantly alluded to by hon. gentlemen opposite, the facts do not bear them out; and I bring forward this evidence with pleasure, as it is in strict confirmation of the very elaborate argument made use of by Sir Charles Tupper in this House.

Now, there is another matter about which hon. gentlemen opposite have made a good deal of capital. They pose now as the friends of the working men. Well, sir, it did occur to me that whatever might be the assumption of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the stand they have taken with reference to any particular class, they could hardly have the "cheek," if I may use the expression, to stand up here as the friends of the workingman. My opinion is that the workingmen of this country have a very lively recollection of the kind of affection hon. gentlemen opposite entertained for them in days gone by. It is within the recollection of every one in this House that the working classes, between the years 1873 and 1878, were in a state approaching poverty. It is a fact that they were crying aloud for assistance from the government. It is a fact that the associations of workingmen throughout the country were pointing out, as did the manufacturers and agriculturists and the representatives of all the industrial

classes, the remedies which they required. But that government turned a deaf ear to everything they said, and very arrogantly gave them to understand that they knew not whereof they were speaking. Now hon. gentlemen opposite say: You told us you were going to restore this country to prosperity. You told us that your leader would exercise his magical wand, of which the people at that time knew nothing, if they would only restore him and his friends to power. Have you done it? Have you been able to straighten out this difficulty under which this or the other industry is laboring and restore prosperity to it? There can be nothing more absurd than this. During the period of depression previous to 1878, it was not the representative men of the conservative party who alone were making these statements. They were but giving voice to what emanated from the people. But at the present time there are no representations of that kind coming to the government. This is a distinction which I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite. From every place in which there was an industry of any kind previous to 1878, there came down to the city of Ottawa, to the finance minister of the day, deputations and petitions, representing the particular grievances of which they complained and telling them all they wanted was simply the opportunity of laying before him their case; but in no single instance did he accede to their wishes. It was in that state of things, upon that case, that the present first minister took the position that these people should be heard. We were then imply giving voice to the wail that came up from the people all over the country, and the sympathy the first minister entertained for them found practical expression in that now historical resolution, known as the National Policy. And the National Policy which he gave to the people is just as popular in Canada, just as strong in the hearts of the people to-day, as it was in 1878. It is the merest folly of hon. gentlemen opposite to compare the position of parties to-day with the position of parties then; to pretend to compare the present state of the country with the state of the country in 1878. What we tell them is this: Before you can charge us with inconsistency, before you can say, bring prosperity to this industry or to that, you must prove that the proprietors and the working classes interested in these industries, that all the mechanical, all the industrial classes of the Dominion, are crying aloud for help, as they did then; but you cannot prove that, because no such proof exists. The people of Canada to-day are enjoying a degree of prosperity which is far beyond that of almost any people in the world. If you compare the condition of our people to-day with the condition of the people of the United States or England, you will find that the National Policy has proved, not only a friend to this country in her days of sunshine but also the best friend she ever had in the time when the clouds appeared upon her commercial horizon. I believe I am but expressing the opinions entertained by the majority of Canada when I say that the first thing that would weaken the confidence which the people now have in the first minister would be the first indication on his part

of departing from the principle of the National Policy. I believe we should adhere to this policy until the industries of this country are strong and firm enough to lay down a bar, when we can do so to our advantage and the advantage of our people. Reference has been made by previous speakers to the remark made by the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Foster), and I wish to allude to that particularly, because it is in keeping with the subject upon which I am now speaking. It shows how very careless these gentlemen are in making their statements. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), in the very eloquent address he delivered to this House a few days ago, referred to the prosperity of the country. He was interrupted by some hon. gentlemen opposite, who referred to the fact that some men of the conservative party, authorized to speak for that party, had declared that under the fostering influence of the National Policy hamlets would grow into villages, villages into towns, and towns into cities. Well, as fate would have it against these hon. gentlemen, in their organ of Saturday last, the *Globe*, just as if that organ never paid attention to these gentlemen at all, there appears a leading editorial under the heading of the extension of Ontario. I will only read from this editoral a few statements, as they will be quite sufficient to show not only the falsity of every thing that has been said, not only against the industries of the province of Ontario, but also the truth of what has been advanced on this side, with reference to increase in population and prosperity. The *Globe* said :

"But let us look at the growth and expansion of Ontario in 1872—the first year of liberal administration—there were 406 townships and 121 village, town and city municipalities in the province. In 1884 these numbers increased to 451 townships and 205 village, town and city municipalities. In 1872 the total population, according to the municipal census was 1,425,000; in 1884 it was 1,752,000. In 1872 the rural population was 1,050,000, and the urban 375,000; in 1884 the rural was 1,117,000 and the urban, 635,000. With such growth, what man in the possession of the five senses, will affirm that public expenditure should have remained a fixed quantity? It is not simply that some of the older counties have been making progress—that new townships have been organised, that hamlets have grown into villages, villages into towns, and towns into cities."

The hon. gentleman for King's, N.B., has his revenge. We all remember how he was taunted by hon. gentlemen across the floor, that such a thing would never be; that it was simply absurd; that it was a prophecy that would never be fulfilled. Speaking of prophecies, I wonder if any of the prophecies hon. gentlemen opposite made, prior to and immediately after 1878, have been fulfilled. I wonder if these hon. gentlemen ever find that their prophecies at that time have proved most miserable failures. After the adoption of this policy we all remember we were told that the grinding monopolies which were created under this tariff would be most oppressive. Well, Sir, it is most remarkable, that during the session of this parliament we find these hon. gentlemen assuming the role of sympathisers with

these capitalists. We find there is no stronger position that they have taken this year, than the charge against the government, that they, by their introduction of this policy, have induced men to put capital into concerns that have not paid, and that these capitalists, these bloated monopolists, are now the objects of their special attention. In one breath it is the poor man; in the other it is the bloated monopolist. Why, do not these gentlemen know that the result of all this capital being put into these industries, which if you will, has in some instances and to some extent failed, is that the commodities produced by these factories have become cheaper, and that the poor man has been benefitted by that. In no sense have the working classes been injured by the National Policy, viewed from any light in which you choose to view it. I wish simply to make a reference to another matter, in regard to which a good deal has been said. I have here a short table, giving a comparison of the taxation in the sixteen years of our confederated life, and a corresponding period in the life of the United States :

PUBLIC DEBT—COMPARATIVE TAXATION

CUSTOMS, STAMPS, EXCISE.

Year.	Canada	United States.
1868	$11,700,081	$351,713,348
1869	11,125,573	336,596,828
1870	13,087,882	376,749,842
1871	16,320,368	346,457,849
1872	17,715,552	344,390,052
1873	17,616,554	299,004,479
1874	16,129,185	288,167,032
1875	20,664,878	265,100,137
1876	18,614,415	262,415,690
1877	17,697,924	247,428,527
1878	17,841,938	239,102,883
1879	18,476,813	246,318,908
1880	18,479,576	307,324,268
1881	23,942,138	329,571,245
1882	27,549,046	363,132,299
1883	29,269,698	355,796,216
Totals	$300,219,021	$4,934,259,597

Taking the population at the middle period we have for the United States a population of 45,000,000, and for Canada 3,900,000. This gives the average amount of taxation per head for the sixteen years at $110 for the people of the United States, $77 per head during the period of sixteen years for Canada. If we had been subject during this period to the same taxation as the people of the United States we would have paid into the treasury the sum of $430,000,000 instead of $300,000,000. I have not included the State taxation. There is one thing in the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite which must have appeared strange to those on this side of the House, that from the very commencement of their criticisms upon the statement of the finance minister, up to the present moment they have not ventured to state, in any one particular, where they would alter this policy if they were so fortunate as to secure the treasury benches. They dare not do it, because, because when you go out into the constituencies and find hon. gentlemen seeking the suffrages of the people you do not find them coming out as flat-footed against the National Policy there as they do in this House. My experience in the election of 1882 was that, in canvassing, they would get hold of a voter, one of their own men, and the canvassed would be told : I am in favor of this National Policy; and then the gentleman who was canvassing would say : Come here and let us have a talk; I am in favor of that, too; but if our friends get into power they are not going to change that." That is what I had to meet in my constituency, among other forcible arguments used to defeat

me. That is the feeling throughout the country. I say that these hon. gentlemen in coming out so strongly against the National Policy, in declaring that it has been of such great injury to the country, that it has hung like a blight over our industries and has retarded our prosperity and the growth of our population, are not representing the men who sent them here. And, if it be a fact, as has been stated on the other side of the House, that hon. gentlemen on this side are never going to come back for some of the votes they have given, I tell them that they will never succeed in assuming the reins of power in this country if they fight out their political battles on the lines they have during this session. I would like to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen very briefly to the condition of the agricultural classes. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who spoke yesterday and to-day, and who assumed to be the special champion of the farmers; who stated that no person could tell him anything about farming; that what he did not know about farming was not worth knowing, first built up a case against the government and then knocked it all to pieces. He declared that there were parties coming to this parliament and that they were determined to have a change of tariff, so far as flour was concerned; and then he went on to show how great a grievance this would be, and he made out quite a case against the government for what they have never done. And he made a most astounding statement, which was, that the policy of the government during the Mackenzie *regime* was to tax the luxuries and lighten the taxes upon the necessaries of life to as large an extent as possible, while, under the present government, he said, the policy was to tax the necessaries at the rate of about 50 per cent. and to let the luxuries go free. I never was more surprised at anything I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite than I was at that. Let me call attention to what treatment and what sort of protection the farmers enjoyed under the Mackenzie *regime*:

Canadian Tariff, 1878.	American.
Wheat, free.....	20 per cent.
Rye and barley, free.....	15 cents per bushel.
Indian corn and oats, free....	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour, free.....	20 per cent.
Rye flour and cornmeal, free.	
Live animals, 10 per cent....	20 per cent.

Then, as to the luxuries—champagne, wine, whiskey, spirits, tobacco, cigars and so on, were all spared heavy duties, high taxation for the necessaries of life being put upon tea, coffee, sugar, quinine, coal oil, books for the blind, bibles when printed seven years, scientific books, and all books printed seven years. That is the way luxuries were taxed under hon. gentlemen opposite. The workingmen of this country, those who, as the last speaker stated, know how to appreciate a dollar when they earn it by hard toil, will duly appreciate the mode of taxing necessaries and luxuries respectively, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and when they pose as the special friends of the poor workingmen and the laboring classes, I can assure them that they are taking a position which is so manifestly inconsistent with their previous record, that they will make no political capital out of it notwithstanding their loud utterances. Now, I want to give just a few more facts, if the House will bear with

me, upon this question. I wish to make a comparison as to the purchasing power of money under this tariff, at the present time, and the purchasing power of money during the time those hon. gentlemen were in power; because, after all, it is only by comparisons of this nature that we can get at the correct state of the case; it is only by comparisons like the one the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) made last session, in this House, that the people understand the practical working of the National Policy. It is exactly like the coal argument. Any man knows what he pays and what he used to pay, and knows what they pay on the other side; but he cannot see where he pays that duty. And it is just so here. Now, Sir, as to the purchasing power of farming products, in 1885, as compared with 1878. In the latter part of 1878 the average price of wheat in Ontario was 84½ cents. Wheat is now quoted at say, 78 cents. The farmer in 1878, sold 60 bushels of wheat at 84½ cents—receiving therefor $50.70, and he then proceeded to make an outlay on home necessaries, with the following result:—

5 lbs. tea at 75 cents	$3.75
25 lbs. of sugar at 9 cents	2.25
3 galls. syrup at $1.00	3.00
3 cwt. flour at $3	9.00
5 lbs starch at 13 cts	0.65
1 dozen canned goods at 25 cts	3.00
20 yds of factory cotton at 9 cts	1.80
20 yds. grey flannel at 45 cts	9.00
2 six-pound blankets at 65 cts. per pound	7.80
10 yds. shirting at 15 cts	1.50
Total	$41.75

After paying his bill he had $8.95 remaining. In 1885 the farmer requires a similar bill of goods, and what is the result? He derives from his 60 bushels of wheat, at 78 cents per bushel, $46.80, and proceeds to invest it as follows:—

5 lbs. tea at 50c	$2.50
25 lbs. sugar at 5c	1.25
3 galls. syrup at 60c	1.80
3 cwt. flour at $2	6.00
5 lbs. starch at 10c	0.50
1 doz. canned goods at 12½c	1.50
20 yds. factory cotton on 7c	1.40
20 yds. grey flannel at 35c	7 00
2 six lb. blankets at 45c	5.40
10 yds. shirting at 12½c	1.25
Total	$28.60

Leaving a remainder to the good of $18.20, or $9.25 more than during the partial free trade era of Sir Richard Cartwright's administration of financial affairs. Mr. speaker, I imagine that when these hon. gentlemen attempt, to talk to the people of the country about what they will do for them—for they have never done anything for them yet—when they can come to the people and attempt, by specious promises to the workingmen, to enlist their sympathy with the party they represent, they will find that the workingmen will not be deluded; they will find that the government which has done so much for the workingmen in the past, which is doing so much for them to-day, not only by protecting our industries, so that they can get the same labor in the country they did before, but also by cheapening some of the commodities, which is the practical result of competition among our industries and of the permanence of our institutions—I say, Sir, that the workingmen will be able to appreciate their arguments at their true value. The cheapening of the commodities is the natural result of this National Policy, if it is tried long enough, because naturally in the first years of a protective tariff, when our industries are struggling for an existence, it is possible

the purchaser may pay a little more than he will afterwards, but the benefit accruing to the people after a few years will be established. In this country, as in all countries, combinations and monopolies will cure themselves. Since the beginning of the world there have been very few monopolies that have not cured themselves; and no monopolies can live where the conditions are favorable to competition, such as they are in this country. Now I notice, also, that our opposition friends are endeavoring to make a good deal of capital out of the subject of assisted immigration. That is something which was taken up by the *Globe* some time ago, and it has been alluded to by the ex-minister of finance, and by all the lights of the party opposite. It is here that their inconsistency comes in again, and it is just as manifest as in all the other arguments they have made use of against this policy. You would hardly believe that in the depression between 1873 and 1878, when our workingmen found it almost impossible to live; that during all that time they brought thousands of mechanics into this country; that during all that time it never occurred to them that it was a shame to bring immigrants into the market, the labor of which was already overcrowded. Yet they stand up to-day and tell this government that they have been doing wrong. Sir, I can see at once that the policy announced by the minister of agriculture here, a few days ago, in reply to the hon. member for Ottawa, was strictly correct. I believe it is time that certain organizations in the old country, and certain charitable institutions, were given to understand, in some way, that Canada is now large enough to have a pauper population of its own. I believe it would be better if we were to discriminate, even more than we have done, against that class of immigrants coming to this country. The government have shown every desire to do in this matter all that any government can do. We have not only the assurance of the minister of agriculture that discrimination will be made against that class of immigrants coming to this country, and that the attention of the government will be devoted to the introduction of agricultural and farm laborers, but we have something more substantial than that; we have the announcement of the minister of finance, in the interests of the mechanical classes, that prison labor will be prohibited altogether. I say, Sir, in concluding these few remarks, that in every respect the government has done everything that it could do for the working classes, for all the industrial classes and in fact, for all the producing classes of this country. I say that no government could have done more than it has done, and as all governments are liable to err, possibly our own government, in some respects, is not infallible. I think the first minister always declared that public men were liable to make mistakes, and governments were liable to make mistakes. But upon this question of the National Policy it will be to the everlasting credit of the first minister, that from the day he announced that policy to the people of Canada he has remained faithful to this principle; and up to this moment he has shown no sign of departing from it; but, as he stated at the magnificent gathering in Toronto, a gathering of the young men, the old men, and the middle aged, who assembled to do him honor, he has nailed that principle to the mast-head of his party, and is willing to stand or fall by it, and in that statement he voiced the sentiments not only of his followers in this country, but, in my opinion, of the large majority of the people of Canada.